Ca	se 2:08-cv-07461-SVW-CW Document 1	Filed 11/12/08 Page 1 of 38 Page ID #:1					
1 2 3 4	Stephen M. Garcia, State Bar No. 12333 sgarcia@lawgarcia.com David M. Medby, State Bar No. 227401 dmedby@lawgarcia.com THE GARCIA LAW FIRM One World Trade Center, Suite 1950 Long Beach, California 90831 Telephone: (562) 216-5270 Facsimile: (562) 216-5271						
5 6 7 8 9 10	Don Howarth, State Bar No. 53783 dhowarth@howarth-smith.com Suzelle M. Smith, State Bar No. 113992 ssmith@howarth-smith.com Darcy R. Harris, State Bar No. 200594 dharris@howarth-smith.com HOWARTH & SMITH 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 728 Los Angeles, California 90014 Telephone: (213) 955-9400 Facsimile: (213) 622-0791	So N					
12	Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Counsel for the Putative Clas	S					
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
15	JENNIFER BURNHAM, CASE SQ. 08-07461SVW						
16	individually and on behalf of a class of others similarly situated,	COLLECTIVE ACTION (CW)					
17	of others similarly strates,	CLASS ACTION					
18	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR:					
19		1. VIOLATION OF THE					
20	VS.	FAIR LABOR STANDARDS					
21	KENDAL FLORAL SUPPLY, LLC,	ACT (FLSA); 2. VIOLATION OF CAL. WAGE ORDERS NO. 4-2001,					
22) NO. 7-2001 & MINIMUM					
23	Defendant.	WAGE ORDER AND CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1182.11,					
24		1194, 1197; 3. VIOLATION OF					
25		CALIFORNIA WAGE PAYMENT PROVISIONS, CAL. LABOR CODE §§201,					
26		202, & 203;					
27		4. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA RECORD-					
28		KEEPING PROVISIONS, CAL. WAGE ORDERS NO. 4-2001 &					

Ca	se 2:08-cv-07461-SVVV-CVV Document 1 Filed 11/12/08 Page 2 of 38 Page ID #:2								
1 2 3	NO. 7-2001, CAL. LABOR CODE §§226, 1174, & 1174.5; 5. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA MEAL AND REST PERIOD PROVISIONS, CAL. WAGE ORDERS NO. 4- 2001 & NO. 7-2001, CAL.								
4	LABOR CODE §§ 218.5, 226.7, & 512;								
5	6. VIOLATION OF REIMBURSEMENT OF								
6 7	EXPENSES AND UNLAWFUL DEDUCTION PROVISIONS, CAL. WAGE ORDERS NO. 4-								
8	2001 & NO. 7-2001; CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 221, 223,								
9	1 LABOR CODE §§ 221, 223, 400-410, & 2802 7. VIOLATION OF								
10	CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW								
11	("UCL"), CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200 ET SEQ. 8. VIOLATION OF ERISA §								
12	502(A)(3); 9. VIOLATION OF ERISA § 2ET SEQ. AND BREACH OF								
13									
14	FIDUCIARY DUTY 10. PLAN ENFORCEMENT								
15	UNDER ERISA, § 502(a)(1)(B)								
16	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL								
17	Plaintiff JENNIFER BURNHAM (hereinafter referred to as "MS.								
18	BURNHAM" or "PLAINTIFF"), an individual, on her own behalf and as								
19	representative of a putative class of similarly situated parties, complains and alleges								
20	as follows:								
21									
22	JURISDICTION AND VENUE								
23 24									
25	1. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over this action pursuant to								
26	28 U.S.C. § 1331; Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29								
27	U.S.C. § 216(b); and Section 501 (e)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security								
28	Act ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. §1132(e)(1).								
	2. This Court also has original jurisdiction over this action under the Class								
	2								

- Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because this is a class action in which: (1) there are 100 or more members in the proposed class; (2) at least some members of the proposed class have a different citizenship from Defendant; and (3) the claims of the proposed class members exceed \$5,000,000 in the aggregate.
- 3. In addition, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiff's California wage and hour law claims, because those claims derive from a common nucleus of operative fact.
- 4. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.
- 5. The Central District of California has personal jurisdiction over KENDAL FLORAL SUPPLY, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "DEFENDANT" or "KENDAL") because KENDAL is a limited liability company organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the State of California, is doing business throughout the State of California, including in this District, and because many of the acts complained of and giving rise to the claims alleged occurred in California
- 6. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) because Defendant resides in this District.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMS

7. Plaintiff, MS. BURNHAM was employed by KENDAL from January 10, 2006 to August 28, 2008. Her duties included operating kiosks for KENDAL at Costco stores that displayed and sold flowers to the public, hiring and supervising other employees, and regularly reporting to the Kendal district manager on a daily and weekly basis. KENDAL directed and controlled the classification of, method of payment to and benefits of MS. BURHAM and other employees. MS. BURNHAM and other employees working at these kiosks and other locations for KENDAL ("KENDAL EMPLOYEE CLASS") were and/or are misclassified by KENDAL as

"independent contractors" and thereby improperly treated as exempt from the provisions of federal law governing employees including the FLSA and/or the applicable state wage and hour laws of California, as described below.

- 8. On September 22, 2008, the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("CDLR") began an investigation of KENDAL's employment practices. Initially, CDLR cited MS. BURNHAM for violations of California labor law; however, those citations have been dismissed because the employer is not MS. BURNHAM but KENDAL. CDLR is pursuing KENDAL for violations because MS. BURHAM and the others she supervises and others similarly situated ("KENDAL EMPLOYEE CLASSES") are not independent contractors but KENDAL employees. At a meeting on MS. BURNHAM's Appeal of the citations, , the Deputy Labor Commissioner Angela Aguilar stated that KENDAL appeared to be the employer of MS. BURNHAM and others, and that they were not independent contractors of KENDAL. MS. BURHAM supervised others and classified them for payment and benefits based on the directions and instructions of KENDAL.
- 9. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all persons who were, are, or will be employed by KENDAL nationwide to work at flower kiosks at Costco and other locations, in various roles, including but not limited to supervisors, helpers and employees ("KENDAL EMPLOYEE CLASSES"), at any time within the three years prior to the filing of this Complaint through the date of the final disposition of this action (the "Nationwide FLSA Period"), and who were, are, or will be misclassified by KENDAL as "independent contractors" and thereby treated as exempt from requirements for employees under federal law, including minimum wage, benefits and overtime compensation. This group is hereinafter referred to as the "KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs."
- 10. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of all persons who were, are, or will be employed by KENDAL in California in the Class Positions (hereinafter the

"KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class"), at any time within the four years prior to the date of the filing of this Complaint through the date of the final disposition of this action (the "California Class Period"), and who were, are, or will be misclassified as "independent contractors" and thereby treated as exempt from requirements for employees under California law, including but not limited to payment of minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work; overtime compensation; meal and rest breaks; workers compensation coverage and other benefits including health benefits; itemized wage statements and payroll deductions for taxes and other required withholdings; payment of all amounts owed upon termination; not making unlawful deductions from payments made to Class members; and reimbursement for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the performance of job duties.

- 11. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of herself and all persons who were, are, or will be employed by Defendant nationwide in the Class Positions within the six years prior to this action's filing date through the date of the final disposition of this action ("the ERISA Class Period"), who were, are, or will be misclassified as "independent contractors" and who should have been included in and covered by KENDAL'S 401(k) Plan ("the 401(k) Plan") and other benefit plans that KENDAL provides to its employees (hereinafter the "KENDAL EMPLOYEE ERISA Class").
- 12. On information and belief, at all relevant times, Defendant has been the plan sponsor of the 401(k) Plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(16)(B), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(B). On information and belief, Defendant has exercised actual responsibility, authority, and/or control with regard to the crediting of compensation under the 401(k) Plan, thereby making it a fiduciary of that plans within the meaning of ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21). On information and belief, KENDAL provides its employees other benefits, including but not limited to health coverage and vacation and sick pay (hereinafter "Other ERISA Benefits Plan"), which

7

8

9

6

10

12

13

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

constitutes an employee welfare benefit plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(1), and an employee benefit plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(3).

- On information and belief, Defendant, at all relevant times, has been and 13. continues to be an employer within the meaning of ERISA § 3(5), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(5), the administrator of the 401(k) Plan, within the meaning of ERISA § 3(16)(A), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A), the named fiduciary of that plan within the meaning of ERISA § 402(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(1), and a fiduciary of that plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21).
- At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant, within the 14. meaning of ERISA § 3(6), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(6), and on information and belief, was entitled to be a participant in the 401(k) Plan and "Other ERISA Benefits Plan" within the meaning of ERISA § 3(7), 29 U.S.C. § 1102(7). KENDAL'S website states: "Our dedication to our employees continues from farm to warehouse. All of the workers employed in the United States have full benefits and a 401K program." See http://www.kendalfloral.com/company/workforce.html.
- Defendant unlawfully classifies Plaintiff, the KENDAL EMPLOYEE 15. Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members as "independent contractors" and thereby treats them as exempt from minimum wage, benefits, and overtime payments required under federal and California Laws and other requirements of California wage and hour law, despite the fact that they are not independent contractors and not exempt from such requirements. Plaintiff, the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members worked hours for which they were not paid minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work, worked overtime hours, as defined by the applicable federal and California laws, and are and have been entitled to lawful compensation for all hours

worked, including premium compensation at one and one-half times the regular hourly rate for overtime hours and at twice the regular hourly rate for some overtime hours ("overtime compensation"), as well as benefits. Defendant KENDAL designed a scheme whereby it paid Plaintiff and the KENDAL Employee CLASS members, not based on hours worked but on KENDAL flowers sold, deducting amounts for flowers not sold. This scheme resulted in underpayments to Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE CLASS members. Defendant has willfully refused to pay Plaintiff, KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members the required lawful minimum wage, benefits and/or overtime compensation for hours worked and has failed to keep time records as required by law. Further, as to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, as a result of such misclassification, Defendant has failed to accord Class members the rights and benefits due to employees under California law, including but not limited to (a) properly calculating the Class members' wages; (b) providing them itemized wage statements; (c) paying them minimum wage and/or that amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work; (d) paying them overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in one day and/or 40 hours in one week; (e) ensuring that they take proper meal and rest breaks or otherwise crediting them for breaks not taken; (f) deducting proper tax and other amounts legally required to be withheld from their pay; (g) providing workers' compensation coverage and other benefits such as health benefits; (h) paying all amounts owed upon termination; (i) not making unlawful deductions from payments made to Class members; and (j) reimbursing KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of their job duties, all as required by applicable California laws, wage orders and regulations.

16. Defendant has failed to include Plaintiff and the ERISA Class in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 401(k) Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan that KENDAL employees are entitled to participate in. Defendant has failed to comply with ERISA's requirement that they maintain records sufficient to determine benefits due or which may become due under the 401(k) Plan and/or the Other ERISA Benefits Plan, as required under ERISA § 209, 29 U.S.C. § 1059.
- 17. Defendant has failed to keep proper records of Plaintiff's and the ERISA Class's work, including overtime work. Defendant has failed to comply with ERISA's requirement that they maintain records sufficient to determine benefits due or which may become due under the 401(k) Plan or the Other ERISA Benefits Plan,, as required under ERISA § 209, 29 U.S.C. § 1059.
- 18. Defendant has failed to credit Plaintiff and the ERISA Class for work, including overtime work, as Compensation under the 401(k) Plan. Defendant has violated ERISA's fiduciary requirement, set forth in ERISA § 404, 29 U.S.C. § 1104.
- 19. Defendant's practices violate the FLSA, ERISA, and the California laws pled herein. Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief, compensation at no less than the minimum wage and/or that which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated over the time period, overtime compensation for all overtime work required, suffered, or permitted by KENDAL, damages for the value of exclusion from the 401(k) plan and other employee benefits such as health insurance, damages for making unlawful deductions from payments made to Class members and/or failing to reimburse them for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the performance of their job duties, liquidated and/or other damages and penalties as permitted by applicable law, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

THE PARTIES

20. Plaintiff MS. BURNHAM is an individual who, at all times relevant

- 21. Plaintiff consents to sue for violations of the FLSA, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b) and 256.
- 22. Defendant KENDAL FLORAL SUPPLY, LLC ("KENDAL") is a limited liability company organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the State of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

California with its headquarters and principal place of business in Carlsbad, in the County of San Diego, and therefore KENDAL is a citizen of California. KENDAL and regularly and systematically injects itself into the commerce stream and does business throughout the State of California, including in San Diego, Santa Cruz, Los Angeles, and Fresno Counties. KENDAL is a grower, supplier and distributor of fresh cut flowers and manufactured bouquets throughout the United States including California, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, as well as Canada. The practices described herein were performed by KENDAL in this district and throughout the United States.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff brings the First Claim for Relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs.

Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective

24.

Plaintiffs are similarly situated in that they have substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and are subject to Defendant KENDAL's common

practice, policy, or plan of unlawfully characterizing KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs as "independent contractors" and thereby

failing and refusing to pay them minimum wage, overtime and other benefits in

25. The First Claim for Relief for violations of the FLSA may be brought and maintained as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to § 16(b) of FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), since the claims of the Plaintiff are similar to the claims of the members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs.

26. The names and addresses of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs are available from KENDAL'S records. Notice should be

violation of the FLSA.

provided to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs via both first class mail and posting in the offices where they have worked as soon as possible.

CALIFORNIA CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 27. Plaintiff brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Claims for Relief for violation of California's wage and hour and unfair competition laws as a class action, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.23 (a), (b)(2), and (b)(3), on behalf of all KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members, defined in paragraph 10.
- 28. The KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that during the California Class Period Defendant KENDAL has employed at least one hundred persons who satisfy the definition of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class.
- 29. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, including, but not limited to, the following:
- a. Whether Defendant improperly misclassified Class members as "independent contractors" rather than employees, in violation of Labor Code ¶ 2750.5, and consequently denied them certain rights and benefits of employment status.
- b. Whether Defendant unlawfully failed to pay minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work, and/or overtime compensation, including overtime premium pay for hours worked in excess of 8 in a day and/or 40 in a week, in violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq., and the California Labor Code and related regulations, Cal. Labor Code §§201, 202, 203, 226, 510, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, Cal. Wage Orders No. 4-

6

7

5

8 9

10 11

13

12

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

24

23

25 26

27 28 2001, No. 7-2001 and California Minimum Wage Order.

- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of wage compensation as required by Labor Code ¶ 226.7 and 8 California Code of Regulations § 11090, in the amount of one hour of pay for each day on which a Class member did not take a meal break within the time required by applicable Wage Orders and Code of California Regulations.
- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of wage compensation as d. required by Labor Code ¶ 226.7 and 8 California Code of Regulations § 11090, in the amount of one hour of pay for each day on which a Class member did not take a rest break within the time required by applicable Wage Orders and Code of California Regulations.
- Whether Defendant unlawfully failed to keep and furnish Class e. members with itemized wage statements and records of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174;
- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of wage compensation by f. making unlawful deductions from payments made to Class members, including for flowers not sold, and/or failing to reimburse them for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the performance of their job duties, in violation of Labor Code §§ 221, 223, 400-410, and 2802.
- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of wage compensation as required by Labor Code § 203 by failing to pay all wages due upon separation or termination of employment.
- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of workers' compensation h. coverage as required by Labor Code § 3700.
- Whether Defendant deprived Class members of benefits including health i. benefits that Defendant provided other employees.
- Whether KENDAL'S policy and practice of misclassifying the Class members as "independent contractors" and failing to provide the rights and benefits

4

5

6

3

7 8

10 11

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28

due to employees constitutes an unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practice under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

- k. The proper measure of damages sustained and the proper measure of restitution recoverable by members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class.
- 30. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members' claims. Plaintiff, like other KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members, was subjected to KENDAL'S policy and practice of refusing to pay minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work, pay overtime compensation, provide itemized wage statements, provide workers' compensation coverage, provide meal and rest breaks, properly calculate compensation, deduct proper tax and other amounts legally required to be withheld from pay, pay all amounts owed upon termination and/or reimburse KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of their job duties, in violation of California law. Plaintiff's job duties were typical of those of other KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of 31. the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions, the FLSA and state labor and employment litigation.
- 32. Class certification of the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Claims for Relief is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because KENDAL has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, making appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members as a whole. Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members are entitled to injunctive relief to end KENDAL'S common and uniform practice of failing to pay

minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work, pay overtime compensation, provide itemized wage statements, provide workers' compensation coverage, provide meal and rest breaks, properly calculate compensation, deduct proper tax and other amounts legally required to be withheld from pay, pay all amounts owed upon termination and/or reimburse Class members for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of their job duties,

Class certification of the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Claims 33. for Relief is also appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because questions of law and fact common to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, and because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation. KENDAL'S common and uniform policies and practices unlawfully treat members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class as "independent contractors" when they are employees entitled to minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified KENDAL employees were being compensated during the time period for similar work, overtime compensation, itemized wage statements, workers' compensation coverage and other benefits including health benefits, meal and rest breaks, itemized wage statements and deductions for proper tax and other amounts legally required to be withheld from pay, payment of all amounts owed upon termination, reimbursement for all necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in connection with performance of their job duties, and other rights and benefits accorded employees under California law. The damages suffered by individual KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members are small compared to the expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation. In addition, class certification is superior because it will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that might result in inconsistent judgments

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

about KENDAL'S practices.

34.

EMPLOYEE California Class as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

ERISA CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff intends to send notice to all members of the KENDAL

35. Plaintiff brings the Seventh and Eighth Claims for Relief for violation of ERISA as a class action, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.23 (a), (b)(1), and/or (b)(2), on behalf of all ERISA Class members, as defined in paragraph 11.

36. The ERISA Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes, that during the ERISA Class Period, Defendant employed over 100 persons who satisfy the definition of the ERISA Class.

37. Questions of law and fact common to the ERISA Class as a whole include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Whether Defendant failed and continues to fail to maintain accurate records of actual time worked and wages earned by Plaintiff and the ERISA Class;

b. Whether Defendant failed and continues to fail to provide accurate wage statements itemizing all actual time worked and wages earned by Plaintiff and the ERISA Class;

c. Whether Defendant has violated and continues to violate ERISA § 209(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1059(a)(1), as alleged herein;

d. Whether Defendant failed to include Plaintiff and the ERISA Class as participants in and provide coverage under the 401(k) Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan to which they were entitled;

e. Whether Defendant credited Plaintiff and the ERISA Class with all Compensation which they were paid or entitled to be paid for purposes of the 401(k) Plan, as required by ERISA;

f. Whether Defendant violated ERISA's fiduciary standards by its failure

to credit Plaintiff and the ERISA Class with all Compensation which they were paid or entitled to be paid for purposes of the 401(k) Plan, as required by ERISA; and

- 38. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the ERISA Class. Plaintiff, like all other ERISA Class members, was subject to Defendant's policies and practices of failing to include ERISA Class members in the 401(k) Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan, and Defendant's policy and practice of failing to record time worked and credit compensation, including overtime compensation, earned or owing as Compensation under the 401(k) Plan.
- 39. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the ERISA Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions and ERISA.
- 40. Class certification of the Seventh and Eighth Claims for Relief is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1) because adjudications with respect to individual members of the class would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other members and/or pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendant acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the ERISA Class, making appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to the Plaintiff and the ERISA Class as a whole.
- 41. Plaintiff intends to send notice to all members of the ERISA Class to the extent required by Rule 23.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Fair Labor Standards Act, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs)

42. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 41 as if they were set forth again herein.

- 43. At all relevant times, KENDAL has been, and continues to be, an "employer" engaged in interstate "commerce" and/or in the production of "goods" for "commerce," within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203. At all relevant times, KENDAL has employed, and continues to employ, "employee[s]," including Plaintiff, and each of the collective KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs. At all relevant times, KENDAL has had gross operating revenues in excess of \$500,000.
- 44. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is the Consent to Sue form signed by Plaintiff in this action pursuant to § 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 216(b) and 256. It is likely that other similarly situated individuals will sign consent forms and join as plaintiffs on this claim in the future.
- 45. The FLSA requires each covered employer, including Defendant KENDAL, to compensate all non-exempt employees at the minimum wage for all hours worked, and at a rate of not less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours in a workweek.
- 46. The KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs are entitled to be paid at the minimum wage for all hours worked, and are entitled to overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.
- 47. At all relevant times, KENDAL, pursuant to its policies and practices, failed and refused to pay minimum wage to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs for all hours worked, and failed to pay overtime premiums to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs for their hours worked in excess of forty hours per week.
- 48. By failing to compensate Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs at the minimum wage for all hours work and for failing to compensate Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours in a workweek, KENDAL has

5

4

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

violated, and continues to violate, the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., including 29 U.S.C. §§ 206, 207(a)(1) and § 215(a).

- By failing to record, report, and/or preserve records of hours worked by 49. Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs. KENDAL has failed to make, keep, and preserve records with respect to each of its employees sufficient to determine their wages, hours, and other conditions and practice of employment, in violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., including 29 U.S.C. § 211(c) and § 215(a).
- The foregoing conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful violation of the 50. FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
- Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE 51. Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, seeks recovery of attorneys' fees and costs of action to be paid by KENDAL, as provided by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide 52. FLSA Collective Plaintiffs, seeks damages in the amount of their respective unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages as provided by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), interest, and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Cal. Wage Orders No. 4-2001, No. 7-2001 & California Minimum Wage Order; Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1182.11, 1194, 1197 Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL 53. EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 52 as if they were set forth again herein.
 - California law requires an employer, such as Defendant, to pay its 54.

5

9

12 13

15 16

14

17

19

18

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 employees minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified employees are being compensated during the time period for similar work, for all hours worked. and to pay overtime compensation to all non-exempt employees for all hours worked over forty per week, or over eight per day.

- 55. Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members are non-exempt employees entitled to be paid minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified employees are being compensated during the time period for similar work, for all hours worked, and to be paid overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.
- Throughout the California Class Period, and continuing through the 56. present, Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members worked in excess of eight hours in a workday and/or forty hours in a workweek. Plaintiff and certain KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members also worked in excess of twelve hours in a workday.
- During the California Class Period, Defendant misclassified Plaintiff 57. and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members as "independent contractors" and thereby exempt from requirements to pay minimum wage or the amount which other similarly qualified employees are being compensated during the time period for similar work, for all hours worked, and to pay overtime compensation, and Defendant failed and refused to pay them at the proper rates for their hours worked.
- As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, as set 58. forth herein, Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members have sustained damages, including loss of earnings for hours worked on behalf of Defendant in an amount to be established at trial, prejudgment interest, and costs and attorneys' fees, pursuant to statute and other applicable law.

///

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(California Wage Payment Provisions, Cal. Labor Code §§201, 202, & 203, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 58 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 60. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendant to pay its employees all wages due within the time specified by law. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages, the employer must continue to pay the subject employees' wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced, up to a maximum of thirty days of wages.
- 61. Plaintiff and all KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members who ceased employment with KENDAL are entitled to unpaid compensation, but to date have not received such compensation.
- 62. More than thirty days have passed since Plaintiff and certain KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members left Defendant's employ.
- 63. As a consequence of Defendant's willful conduct in not paying compensation for all hours worked, Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members whose employment ended during the class period are entitled to thirty days' wages under Labor Code § 203, together with interest thereon and attorneys' fees and costs.

24 | ///

2.1

25 | ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 | ///

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(California Record-Keeping Provisions, Cal. Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001; Cal. Labor Code §§226, 1174, & 1174.5, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- 64. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 63 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 65. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements including, inter alia, hours worked, to Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members in accordance with Labor Code § 226(a) and the IWC Wage Orders. Such failure caused injury to Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members, by, among other things, impeding them from knowing the amount of wages to which they are and were entitled. At all times relevant herein, Defendant has failed to maintain records of hours worked by Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members as required under Labor Code § 1174(d).
- 66. Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members are entitled to and seek injunctive relief requiring Defendant to comply with Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 1174(d), and further seek the amount provided under Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 1174.5, including the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period.

25 | ///

///

26 | ///

27 ///

28 | ///

(California Meal and Rest Period Provisions, Cal. Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001; Cal. Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226.7, & 512, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- 67. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 66 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 68. Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members regularly work and have worked in excess of five-hour shifts without being afforded at least a half-hour meal break in which they were relieved of all duty, as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001, § 11(a).
- 69. In addition, Plaintiff and KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members regularly work and have worked without being afforded at least one tenminute rest break, in which they were relieved of all duty, per four hours of work performed or major fraction thereof, as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7 and Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001, § 12
- 70. As a result of Defendant's failure to afford proper meal periods, it is liable to Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the proper meal periods were not provided, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001, § 11(b).
- 71. As a result of Defendant's failure to afford proper rest periods, it is liable to Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the proper rest periods were not provided, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001, § 12(b).

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Reimbursement of Business Expenses and Unlawful Deductions from Wages

2 3

4

Provisions, Cal. Wage Orders No. 4-2001 & No. 7-2001; Cal. Labor Code &&

221, 223, 400-410, & 2802, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL 72. EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 71 as if they were set forth again herein.
- Labor Code § 221 provides: "It shall be unlawful for any employer to 73. collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee."
- Labor Code § 223 provides: "Where any statute or contract requires an 74. employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or by contract."
- Labor Code §§ 400-410 ("Employee Bond Law") provide the limited 75. circumstances under which an employer can exact a cash bond from its employees. These provisions are designed to protect employees against the very real danger of an employer taking or misappropriating employee funds held by the employer in trust.
- Labor Code §§ 2802 provides: "An employer shall indemnify his or her 76. employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties "
- 77. These and related statutes, along with California's fundamental public policy protecting wages and wage scales, prohibit employers from subjecting employees to unanticipated or unpredicted reductions in their wages; making employees the insurers of their employer's business losses; otherwise passing the ordinary business losses of the employer onto the employee; or taking deductions from wages for business losses in any form unless the employer can establish that the

loss was caused by a dishonest or willful act, or gross negligence of the employee.

- 78. Defendant has violated <u>Cal. Labor Code §§ 221, 223, 400-410</u>, & 2802 and IWC wage order Nos. 4 & 7, § 8 by unlawfully taking deductions from Plaintiff's and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class' compensation to cover certain ordinary business expenses of Defendant, including but not limited to deductions for unsold flowers and "shrinkage", and by failing to reimburse and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class for such expenditures.
- 79. Because Defendant made such unlawful deductions and/or failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class for such expenditures, Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class has been injured and Defendant is liable for the compensation that should have been paid but for the unlawful deductions and/or amount of expenses that should have been reimbursed, pursuant to <u>Cal. Labor Code §§ 221, 223, 400-410</u>, & 2802 and IWC wage order Nos. 4 & 7, § 8.
- 80. By unlawfully deducting wages and failing to pay Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members, Defendant is also liable for reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under <u>Labor Code § 218.5</u>.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(California Unfair Competition Law, Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class)

- 81. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all members of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 80 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 82. The foregoing conduct, as alleged, violates the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. Section 17200 of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code prohibits unfair competition by prohibiting, inter alia, any

3

5

6

4

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

unlawful or unfair business acts or practices.

- Beginning at a date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least as long ago as four 83. years before the filing of this action, Defendant committed, and continues to commit, acts of unfair competition, as defined by the UCL, by, among other things, engaging in the acts and practices described herein. Defendant's conduct as herein alleged has injured Plaintiff and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class by wrongfully denying them earned wages, and therefore was substantially injurious to Plaintiff and to the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class.
- Defendant engaged in unfair competition in violation of the UCL by 84. violating, inter alia, each of the following laws. Each of these violations constitutes an independent and separate violation of the UCL:
 - a. The Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.;
 - b. California Labor Code § 1194;
 - c. California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, & 203;
 - d. California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226.7, & 512;
 - e. California Labor Code §§ 221, 223, 400-410, & 2802
 - f. California Labor Code § 1174;
 - g. California Labor Code §§ 1182.11 & 1197; and
 - h. California Labor Code § 510, which provides in relevant part:
- Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.
 - Defendant's course of conduct, acts, and practices in violation of the 85.

California laws mentioned in the above paragraph constitute a separate and independent violation of the UCL. Defendant's conduct described herein violates the policy or spirit of such laws or otherwise significantly threatens or harms competition.

- 86. The unlawful and unfair business practices and acts of Defendant, described above, have injured the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members in that they were wrongfully denied the payment of minimum wage, benefits and/or overtime compensation.
- 87. Plaintiff, on behalf herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class members, seeks recovery of attorneys' fees and costs of this action to be paid by KENDAL, as provided by the UCL and California Labor Code §§ 218, 218.5, and 1194.
- 88. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the KENDAL EMPLOYEE California Class, seeks restitution in the amount of the respective unpaid wages earned and due for all hours worked.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(ERISA § 502(a)(3) Based on Failure to Maintain Records Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the ERISA Class)

- 89. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the ERISA Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 88 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 90. ERISA § 209(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1059(a)(1), requires that an employer which sponsors an employee benefit plan maintain records with respect to each of its employees sufficient to determine the benefits due or which may become due to such employees.
 - 91. On information and belief, the 401(k) Plan is an employee pension

- On information and belief, pursuant to the terms of the 401(k) Plan. employees' rights to share in the contributions to the Plan are dependent, in part, on their Compensation, which includes, among other things, employees' wages. On information and belief, pursuant to the terms of the Other ERISA Benefits Plan, employees' rights to benefits including health coverage and vacation and sick pay are dependent, in part, on their hours worked.
- By its failure to record and/or report all of the hours worked by Plaintiff 93. and members of the prospective ERISA Class, Defendant has failed to maintain records with respect to each of its employees sufficient to determine the benefit accrual rights of 401(k) Plan participants and accrual rights under the Other ERISA Benefits Plan, in violation of ERISA § 209(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1059(a)(1).
- In order to remedy this violation of ERISA by Defendant, Plaintiff on 94. behalf of herself and members of the ERISA Class seeks injunctive relief, benefits. restitution, and such other equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper, as provided by Section 502(a)(3) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3).
- Plaintiff on behalf of herself and members of the ERISA Class seeks 95. recovery of their attorneys' fees and costs of action to be paid by Defendant, as provided by Section 502(g)(1) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)(1).

/// 27 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

(ERISA § 2 et seq. (29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.), Brought by Plaintiff on Behalf of Herself and the ERISA Class)

- 96. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the ERISA Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 95 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 97. ERISA § 404(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1), requires that employee benefit plan fiduciaries discharge their duties with respect to the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries and, inter alia, (1) for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries and defraying reasonable expenses of administration; (2) with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with such matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of like character and with like aims; and (3) in accordance with the documents and instruments governing the plan.
- 98. On information and belief, the governing instrument of the 401(k) Plan confers on Defendant discretionary authority, responsibility, and/or control with respect to the crediting of compensation, thereby rendering Defendant a fiduciary in that regard.
- 99. On further information and belief, Defendant has exercised actual discretionary authority, responsibility, and/or control in determining what compensation would and would not be credited under the 401(k) Plan. By reason of the exercise of such discretion, Defendant has been a fiduciary of that plan with respect to the crediting of compensation.
- 100. Defendant has breached its fiduciary duties by failing to include Plaintiff and the ERISA Class in the 401(k) Plan and by failing to credit compensation due for work performed by the Plaintiff and the members of the ERISA Class as

Compensation under the 401(k) Plan.

- 101. Pursuant to ERISA § 502(a)(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3), the Plaintiff on behalf of herself and all members of the ERISA Class seeks an injunction requiring Defendant to include all members of the ERISA Class in the 401(k) Plan and to credit them with Compensation under the 401(k) Plan for all of the past and future work performed by those Class members and any such other equitable relief as this Court deems appropriate.
- 102. Plaintiff on behalf of herself and members of the ERISA Class, seek recovery of their attorneys' fees and costs of action to be paid by Defendant, as provided by Section 502(g)(1) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)(1).

TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Plan Enforcement Under ERISA, § 502(a)(1)(B))

- 103. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the ERISA Class, re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 102 as if they were set forth again herein.
- 104. Under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), §502(a)(1)(B), 29 U.S.C. §1132(a)(1)(B), Plaintiff is entitled to clarify and enforce her rights and those of the ERISA Class Members pertaining to all benefits owed under any plans for which they are eligible, include the 401K Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan.
- 105. Plaintiff has either attempted to exhaust administrative remedies but was prevented by Defendant from exhausting such remedies, or exhaustion would be futile wherein Defendant has adjudged Plaintiff and the ERISA Class Members to be independent contractors rather than employees.
- 106. By wrongfully classifying Plaintiff and the ERISA Class Members as ineligible under the 401K Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan, Defendant has

violated, and continues to violate, the terms of the plans and the rights of Plaintiff and the ERISA Class thereunder.

107. Plaintiff and the ERISA Class Members are properly classified as employees and have the right to payment of benefits pursuant to the Defendant's ERISA benefit plans. Accordingly, under 29 U.S.C.§1132(a)(1)(B), Plaintiff and the ERISA Class Members are entitled to declaratory relief as to pension, health, disability, group insurance, dependent care, and/or other benefits that were not paid as a result of their improper classification and an award of such benefits or the value thereof.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff on behalf of herself and all members of the Nationwide FLSA Class, prays for relief as follows:

- A. Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs (asserting FLSA claims) and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of the FLSA Opt-In Class, apprising them of the pendency of this action, and permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual Consent to Sue forms pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- B. Designation of Plaintiff as Representative of the KENDAL EMPLOYEE Nationwide FLSA Collective Plaintiffs;
- C. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA;
- D. An award of damages, according to proof, including liquidated damages, to be paid by Defendant;
 - E. Costs of action incurred herein, including expert fees;
 - F. Attorneys' fees, including fees pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216;
 - G. Post-Judgment interest, as provided by law; and

A declaration that the practices complained of herein violate ERISA §

T.

209(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1129(a) and that Plaintiff and the ERISA class members are full participants in all ERISA plans otherwise available to Defendant's other employees:

- Appropriate equitable and injunctive relief including retroactive benefits U. and equitable restitution to remedy Defendant's violations of ERISA § 209(a):
- A declaration that Defendant has breached its fiduciary duties by failing V. to include Plaintiff and the ERISA Class in the 401(k) Plan and the Other ERISA Benefits Plan and failing to credit the Plaintiff and the ERISA Class with Compensation for all work performed, as required by ERISA and the terms of the 401(k) Plan;
- An order requiring that Defendant remedy its breaches of fiduciary duty W. by crediting Plaintiff and the ERISA Class with Compensation for all of their past. present, and future uncompensated work;
 - X. Attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- Y. Such other injunctive and equitable relief as the Court may deem necessary, just, and proper.

Dated: November 11, 2008

THE GARCIA LAW FIRM HOWARTH & SMITH

By:

Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Counsel for the Putative Class

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

Dated: November 11, 2008

THE GARCIA LAW FIRM HOWARTH & SMITH

By: Don Howarth

Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Counsel for the Putative Class

for

CONSENT TO JOIN AND SUE FORM

Consent to Sue under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)

I, Jennifer Burnham, was an employee of Kendal Floral Supply, LLC (Kendal) beginning in January, 2006.

I have read and approve the complaint in Burnham v. Kendal Floral Supply, LLC and consent to and choose to participate in the FLSA collective action, among other causes of action, set forth therein.

I choose to be represented in this matter by the named plaintiff and counsel (Howarth & Smith and The Garcia Law Firm) in this action.

Jennifer Burnham

Day of November, 2008

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to	District Judge Stephen V. Wilson and the assigned
discovery Magistrate Judge is Carla	Woehrle.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV08- 7461 SVW (CWx)

District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.
All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
=======================================
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).
Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:
[X] Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516 Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

David M. Medby, SBN 227401						
The Garcia Law Firm						
Don Howarth, SBN 53783 Howarth & Smith						
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC						
Jennifer Burnham, individually and on behalf of a	CASE NUMBER					
class of others similarly situated PLAINTIFF(S) v.	CV08-07461 SVW (CW)					
Kendal Floral Supply, LLC						
DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS					
nust serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached 🗹 counterclaim 🗆 cross claim or a matien and a R. 1. 10	amminum til					
One World Trade Center, #1950, Long Beach, CA 9083; adgment by default will be entered against you for the resour answer or motion with the court.	c of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Garcia Law Firm , whose address					
or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, The One World Trade Center, #1950, Long Beach, CA 9083 addgment by default will be entered against you for the recour answer or motion with the court. Dated:	dof the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Garcia Law Firm, whose address If you fail to do selief demanded in the complaint. You also must file					
One World Trade Center, #1950, Long Beach, CA 9083; adgment by default will be entered against you for the resour answer or motion with the court.	c of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Garcia Law Firm, whose address If you fail to do selief demanded in the complaint. You also must file Deputy Clerk					

SUMMONS

Case 2:08-cv-07461-SVW-CW Document 1 Filed 11/12/08 Page 36 of 38 Page ID #:36

Case 2:08-cv_07461-\$\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{0}\text{8} \quad \text{Page 37 of 38} \quad \text{Page ID #:37}

L(a) BLAINTIEES (Chack box if you are representing yourself [])										
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □)				DEFENDANTS						
Jennifer Burnham, individ situated,	nilarly	Kendali Floral Supp	oly, LLC	;						
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Adyourself, provide same.)	presenting Att	orneys (If Known)			****					
The Garcia Law Firm, 1W Howarth & Smith, 523 W.	0831									
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)			III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)							
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party))	Citizen of This Stat	e	PTF □ 1	DEF □ 1	Incorporated or P of Business in thi		PTF □ 4	DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State				□ 5	□ 5	
		C	Citizen or Subject of	f a Foreign Country	/ □ 3	□ 3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in on	• 1									
Ø 1 Original Proceeding								l		
•	AINT: JURY DEMAND: 🗹 Y	es □ N	No (Check 'Yes' or	ly if demanded in c	omplain	it.)				
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23: ☑ Yes ☐ No		□мо	NEY DEMANDEI	IN CC	MPLA	INT: \$			
	e the U.S. Civil Statute under which S.C. Section 201, et seq.) & Other				ause. D	o not ci	te jurisdictional sta	atutes unless div	ersity.)	
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Plac	e an X in one box only.)								*************	
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT		TORTS	TORTS			RISONER	LAI		
☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust	☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	□ 310 A		PERSONAI PROPERTY	A 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Hermon Carl Strategy	PETITIONS Motions to	▼710 Fair La Act	bor Star	ndards
☐ 430 Banks and Banking	□ 130 Miller Act		Airplane Product Liability	□ 370 Other Frau			Vacate Sentence	□ 720 Labor/		
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of	3	Assault, Libel &	☐ 371 Truth in L ☐ 380 Other Pers		□ 530	Habeas Corpus General	Relatio		
☐ 460 Deportation	Overpayment &		Slander	Property D			Death Penalty	□ 730 Labor/. Report		
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced	Enforcement of		Fed. Employers' Liability	□ 385 Property D	Damage			Disclos	sure Act	
and Corrupt Organizations	Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act	□ 340 i	-	Product Li BANKRUPTO	PRO 150 TAX STORY	m een	Other	□ 740 Railwa		Act
	☐ 151 Medicare Act	□ 345 l	Marine Product	☐ 422 Appeal 28	enements of colors (Civil Rights Prison Condition	□ 790 Other I Litigat		
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.		Liability Motor Vehicle	158		interestation in	RFEITURE /	□ 791 Empl. 1		
□ 810 Selective Service	Veterans)		Motor Vehicle	423 Withdraw	al 28		PENALTY	Securit	Backen School of the C	
☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	Overpayment of	1	Product Liability	USC 157 CIVIL RIGH	TQ		Agriculture Other Food &	PROPERT		ITS
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12	Veteran's Benefits	1	Other Personal Injury	□ 441 Voting	***	020	Drug	☐ 820 Copyri ☐ 830 Patent	gms	
USC 3410	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits		Personal Injury-	☐ 442 Employme		□ 625	Drug Related	□ 840 Traden	ıark	
☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Act	☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product	1	Med Malpractice	□ 443 Housing/A			Seizure of	SOCIAL S		TY
□ 892 Economic Stabilization	Liability		Personal Injury- Product Liability	□ 444 Welfare	115		Property 21 USC 881	□ 861 HIA (1 □ 862 Black I		23)
Act	□ 196 Franchise	1	Asbestos Personal	☐ 445 American	with	□ 630	Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC/		,
□ 893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY		Injury Product	Disabilitie			R.R. & Truck	(405(g)		
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act	☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY O	Liability MIGRATION	Employme □ 446 American			Airline Regs Occupational	□ 864 SSID T		I
	☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462 l	Naturalization	Disabilitie		300	Safety /Health	□ 865 RSI (40 FEDERAL		ИTS
nation Under Equal	□ 240 Torts to Land	1	Application	Other		□ 690		□ 870 Taxes (
Access to Justice	245 Tort Product Liability	1	Habeas Corpus- Alien Detainee	440 Other Civi	il			or Defe	,	
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	□ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 465 (Other Immigration Actions	Rights				□ 871 IRS-Th USC 76		y 26
		<u> </u>								
					<u> 11. </u>					
			BN 08	0740	草					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Number:	¥%.	<u> </u>		yejan					

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Case 2:08-cv-07461-SVW-CW Document 1 Filed 11/12/08 Page 38 of 38 Page ID #:38 CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? Viv

If yes, list case number(s):								
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Har If yes, list case number(s):	ve any cases been pre	viously filed in this court tha	at are related to the present case? ☑ No □ Yes					
□ B.	Arise from the same Call for determinati For other reasons w	e or closely related transactio on of the same or substantial ould entail substantial duplic	ons, happenings, or events; or ly related or similar questions of law and fact; or cation of labor if heard by different judges; or 6, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.					
IX. VENUE: (When completing th	e following informat	ion, use an additional sheet i	f necessary.)					
			of other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
			Fresno					
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
Los Angeles								
(c) List the County in this District Note: In land condemnation			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. ved.					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
Los Angeles								
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Berna Note: In land condemnation cases, u	ardino, Riverside, V	entura, Santa Barhara, or tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties					
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	(OR PRO PER):	The second	Date					
or other papers as required by la	aw. This form, appro-	ved by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings be of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)					
Key to Statistical codes relating to S	Social Security Cases	;						
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action					
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))						
862	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)							
863	DIWC		d workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widov	ws or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security					

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))

Act, as amended.

U.S.C. (g))

864

865

SSID

RSI